



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

<b>Applicant</b>	Merced Area Groundwater Pool Interests	<b>County</b>	Merced
<b>Project Title</b>	Prop for Evaluation of Artificial Recharge Potential and Auto Monitoring of GW Levels in CASGEM Wells	<b>Grant Request</b>	\$ 250,000.00
		<b>Total Project Cost</b>	\$ 315,000.00

**Project Description:** The Merced Area Groundwater Pool Interests (MAGPI) proposal evaluates the potential for artificial recharge in the vicinity of El Nido Basin and installs continuously-recording dataloggers to automate the monitoring groundwater elevations in 34 selected CASGEM observation and production wells at strategic locations within the Merced Basin.

### Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	3
Work Plan	8
Budget	3
Schedule	3
QA/QC	3
Past Performance	1
Geographical Balance	0
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>26</b>

- **GWMP or Program:** The applicant has a GWMP that was adopted on December 27, 1997, by MAGPI. The GWMP was updated in 2008, and was adopted on July 30, 2008. A copy of the resolution (Resolution No. 2008-3) adopting the GWMP Update is appended to the application.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is not fully addressed. The application properly addresses the long term need, merit, and ongoing use of the proposed projects (Evaluation of Recharge Potential and Automated Monitoring of Groundwater Levels in CASGEM Wells). However, the proposal does not address how the applicant collaborates with other local public agencies with regard to the management of the affected groundwater basin. It does not address how stakeholders, including the public, will be notified of the project.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is addressed but is not thoroughly documented. The proposed project is to evaluate the potential for artificial recharge in the vicinity of El Nido in southwest Merced Basin, and install continuously-recording data loggers to monitor groundwater elevations at 34 locations (CASGEM observations and production wells) within the Merced Basin. The proposed work can reasonably fulfill the proposal objectives and are consistent with the schedule and budget, and the strategy for evaluating progress is sound. The application indicates the El Nido property has been used for occasional recharge of excess surface water over the past 50 years, and because the proposed pilot recharge test at the property will not constitute a significant long-term change in land use, a CEQA document is not anticipated. However, applicable exemptions and appropriate sections of code pertaining to CEQA still need to be addressed, and this information was not provided in the application.
- **Budget:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. Table 1 includes an estimated budget summary broken down by task for labor, equipment, subcontractor, laboratory, well supplies and materials, and miscellaneous. It also contains a summary of project hours that shows for each task the hours needed to complete the task and hourly rates for each employee classification. The application states the grant amount requested is \$250,000, but Table 1 states that the estimated budget is \$250,200. If the additional funds are for work in-kind, that should have been documented as described in the PSP. An explanation of what miscellaneous costs are should also be included. The work plan states that Gregg drilling will be used for the CPT exploration; the applicant should have provided an estimate from Gregg, or at least provided narrative that discussed how this value was determined. This is also applicable to Task 3, which is to install monitoring wells.



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## *IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013*

---

- **Schedule:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The proposed project length is 17 months, with a start date of May 1, 2013, and a proposed end date of September 30, 2014, which is within the PSP designated time frame of 2 years. However, as CEQA was not adequately addressed in the work plan, the schedule does not include any time for obtaining environmental permits or to complete CEQA documentation. Also, the applicant does not discuss how the schedule was derived or how obstacles would be overcome.
- **QA/QC:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The applicant states that QA/QC measures will be implemented through several existing procedures that have been successfully utilized on previous grants and other projects. However, descriptions of some of these procedures or protocols were not provided (e.g., chain-of-custody procedures; protocols for sample purging, collection, and preservation). Quality assurance measures were not addressed at the task level or incorporated into the work plan.
- **Past Performance:** The criterion is minimally addressed and not documented. Of the three examples provided only one met the time frame requirement stated in the PSP. The description provides no details on the management of the project: how the budget was managed, if the project was on schedule, and measures were taken to ensure the project met the schedule.